

Unilateral Small Deviations of Processes Related to the Fractional Brownian Motion

G. MOLCHAN

*International Institute of Earthquake Prediction Theory and Mathematical
Geophysics, Moscow
The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste*

Abstract. Let $x(s)$, $s \in R^d$ be a Gaussian self-similar random process of index H . We consider the problem of log-asymptotics for the probability p_T that $x(s)$, $x(0) = 0$ does not exceed a fixed level in a star-shaped expanding domain $T \cdot \Delta$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. We solve the problem of the existence of the limit, $\theta := \lim(-\log p_T)/(\log T)^D$, $T \rightarrow \infty$, for the fractional Brownian sheet $x(s)$, $s \in [0, T]^2$ then $D = 2$, and we estimate θ for the integrated fractional Brownian motion then $D = 1$.

¹ Supported in part by the European Commission's Project 12975 (NEST) "Extreme Events: Causes and Consequences (E2-C2)".

AMS 2000 Subject Classification. Primary - 60G15, 60G18

Key words and phrases: small deviations, decay exponents, fractional Brownian motion, level crossing probability

Abbreviated Title. Existence of Decay Exponents

1 Introduction

Let $x(s)$, $s \in R^d$, $x(0) = 0$ be a Gaussian random process and $\Delta_T \ni 0$ an expanding subset of R^d . For many reasons it is important for applications to know the asymptotics of the probability p_T that $x(s)$ does not exceed a fixed level in Δ_T ,

$$p_T = P\{\sup x(s) < \text{const}, s \in \Delta_T\}, \quad T \rightarrow \infty \quad (1)$$

(see [4], [6], [10, 11]). It has been sometimes possible to find the order of logarithmic asymptotics of p_T [4]. The second (in importance) problem is the existence of the decay exponent, that is,

$$-\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \log p_T / \psi_T = \theta \quad (2)$$

if $\log p_T = O(\psi_T)$. The exact values of θ are known only for a few cases [12, 7].

Below we consider the fractional Brownian sheet $x(s)$, $s \in R^2$ for which

$$Ex(s)x(t) = B(s_1, t_1)B(s_2, t_2), \quad (3)$$

where $B(a, b) = \frac{1}{2}(|a|^{2H} + |b|^{2H} - |a - b|^{2H})$, $0 < H < 1$ is the correlation function of the fractional Brownian motion $b_H(a)$, $a \in R^1$. In the case of the Brownian sheet ($H = 1/2$) and $\Delta_T = [0, T]^2$ Csáki et al. [1] prove that

$$c_1/\rho_T \leq -\log p_T/(\log T)^2 \leq c_2,$$

where $\rho_T = \log \log T$. Later, W. Li and Q. Shao [4] removed the $\log \log$ term ρ_T and formulated the problem to prove (2). Below we do this for any $0 < H < 1$. With that end in view we consider the problem (1,2) for a self-similar process of index H (H -ss process). Self-similarity means that finite dimensional distributions of $\{x(\lambda s)\}$ and $\{\lambda^H x(s)\}$ are identical for any $\lambda > 0$. For the H -ss process the problem (1, 2) is reduced to a similar one for events of the type $\{x(s) < 0, s \in \Delta_T \setminus U_0\}$, where U_0 is a vicinity of points $\{s : Ex^2(s) = 0\}$. The existence of the decay exponent (2) is deduced from the positivity of (3) and Slepian's lemma. We consider also the integrated fractional Brownian motion to find bounds of θ in this case.

2 General results

In what follows $x(s)$, $s \in R^d$, $x(0) = 0$ is a centered H -ss continuous process and Δ is a star-shaped domain centered at 0. The following notation will be used: $M_T = \sup\{x(s), s \in T \cdot \Delta\}$ is the maximum of x in $T \cdot \Delta$; $G_T = \{s : x(s) = M_T, s \in T \cdot \Delta\}$ is the set of positions of M_T ; $Z_T = \{s : x(s) = 0, s \in T \cdot \Delta\}$ is the set of zeroes $x(s)$ in $s \in T \cdot \Delta$, and $S_0 = \{s : Ex(s)^2 = 0\}$ is the non-random set of zeroes $x(s)$. Note that $S_0 = \{0\}$ for an H -ss process with one-dimensional time.

The key observation for the analysis of (1, 2) is that a typical trajectory of the 1- D H -ss process $x(s)$ with small M_T has its G_T and Z_T close to S_0 . For example, if $x(s)$ is a Levy stable process and $|x|$ is not a subordinator, then the position of maximum, G_T , under the condition $\{M_T < 1\}$ has a non-trivial limit distribution as $T \rightarrow \infty$ without any normalization [8]. Therefore the events $\mathcal{A}_T$, namely,

$$\{M_T < 1\}, \quad \{G_T \subset U_0\}, \quad \{Z_T \subset U_0, \quad x|_{\partial(T \cdot \Delta \setminus U_0)} < 0\}, \quad (4)$$

where U_0 is some vicinity of S_0 are considered as characteristic in the problem (1, 2). By $\mathcal{A}_T(\xi)$, $\xi = M, G, Z$ we denote the above events for further reference. Consider a one-to-one mapping $s_T : [0, 1]^d \ni a \rightarrow s \in U_0 \cap T \cdot \Delta$ and define

$$\delta_T^2(h) = \sup\{E|x(s(a)) - x(s(a'))|^2, a, a' \in [0, 1]^d, |a - a'| < h\}.$$

Theorem 1. Let $x(s)$, $x(0) = 0$, $s \in R^d$ be a centered H -ss continuous Gaussian process and $\{\mathcal{H}_x, \|\cdot\|_x\}$ the reproducing kernel Hilbert space associated with $x(\cdot)$ (see, e.g., [5]). Suppose there exist a set $U_0 \supset S_0$, elements $\varphi_T \in \mathcal{H}_x$, and slowly increasing functions $\psi(T)$ and σ_T such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{(a) } \varphi_T(s) \geq 1, \quad s \in (T \cdot \Delta) \setminus U_0, \quad \|\varphi_T\|_x^2 = o(\psi(T)) \\ & \text{(b) } \psi(T'a)/\psi(T) \rightarrow 1, \quad T \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for any } a > 0, \\ & \quad \text{where } T' = T/(\sigma_T^2 \cdot \psi(T))^{1/2H} \quad \text{and} \\ & \text{(c) } \sigma_T \geq \sup\{(E|x(s)|^2)^{1/2}, s \in U_0 \cap T \cdot \Delta\} + \left| \int_0^1 \delta_T(h) d\sqrt{\ln 1/h} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Then all events $\mathcal{A}_T$ in (4) have the decay exponents

$$\theta_\psi[x, \Delta] = -\lim(\log P(\mathcal{A}_T))/\psi(T), \quad T \rightarrow \infty \quad (6)$$

simultaneously only and these exponents are equal to each other.

Remarks. The condition (5b) holds for $\psi(T)$ and σ_T of the $(\log T)^\alpha$, $\alpha \geq 0$ type. The conditions (5b,c) are based on Fernique's estimate for the distribution of the maximum of $|x(s)|$ in $U_0 \cap T \cdot \Delta$. If a similar bound due to Talagrand (see, e.g., [5]) is used, then (5c) can be replaced with

$$\sigma_T \geq \sup\{(E|x(s)|^2)^{1/2}, s \in U_0 \cap T \cdot \Delta\} + E \sup\{|x(s)|, s \in U_0 \cap T \cdot \Delta\}.$$

PROOF. For any $\varphi_T \in \{\mathcal{H}_x, \|\cdot\|_x\}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} p_T &= P\{x(s) < 1, s \in T \cdot \Delta\} = \\ &= P\{x(s) - \varphi_T(s) < 1 - \varphi_T(s), s \in T \cdot \Delta\} = E \mathbf{1}_{\omega_T < 1 - \varphi_T} \pi(\omega_T), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\pi(\omega_T)$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the two Gaussian measures corresponding to the processes $x(\cdot) + \varphi_T(\cdot)$ and $x(\cdot)$ on $T \cdot \Delta$. By the Cameron-Martin formula, $\ln \pi(\omega_T)$ is a Gaussian variable with mean $-\|\varphi_T\|_{x,T}^2/2$ and variance $\|\varphi_T\|_{x,T}^2$, where

$$\|\varphi_T\|_{x,T} = \inf\{\|\tilde{\varphi}_T\|_x, \tilde{\varphi}_T \in \mathcal{H}_x, \tilde{\varphi}_T(s) = \varphi_T(s), s \in T \cdot \Delta\} \leq \|\varphi_T\|_x.$$

Therefore, $E \pi^q(\omega_T) = \exp(q(q-1)\|\varphi_{x,T}\|_x^2/2)$.

Applying to (7) Hölder's inequality with parameters $(p, q) = ((1-\varepsilon)^{-1}, \varepsilon^{-1})$, we can continue (7):

$$p_T \leq P\{x_T < 1 - \varphi_T, s \in T \cdot \Delta\}^{1-\varepsilon} \exp(\|\varphi_T\|_x^2(\varepsilon^{-1} - 1)/2).$$

Taking into account (5a), choose ε as follows: $\varepsilon^2 = \|\varphi_T\|^2/\psi(T)$. Then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$p_T \leq P\{x(s) < 0, s \in T \cdot \Delta \setminus U_0\}^{1-\varepsilon} e^{\varepsilon\psi(T)/2} = P\{\mathcal{A}_T(Z)\}^{1-\varepsilon} e^{\varepsilon\psi(T)/2}. \quad (8)$$

The following inequality is obvious:

$$P(\mathcal{A}_T(Z)) \leq P(\mathcal{A}_T(G)). \quad (9)$$

Lastly, for any $c_T > 0$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{A}_T(G)) &\leq P(G_T \subset U_0, M(U_0 \cap T \cdot \Delta) < c_T) + P(M(U_0 \cap T \cdot \Delta) > c_T) \\ &\leq P(M_T < c_T) + P(M(U_0 \cap T \cdot \Delta) > c_T), \end{aligned}$$

where $M(I) = \max(|x(s)|, s \in I)$.

From the H -ss property of $x(\cdot)$ and similarity of domains $T \cdot \Delta$ we get

$$P(M_T < c_T) = P(M_{T'} < 1), \quad T' = T c_T^{-1/H}.$$

By (5b,c), for large enough T and $c_T = \sqrt{a\psi(T)}\sigma_T$ we have

$$P(M(U_0 \cap T \cdot \Delta) > c_T) < \exp(-\bar{c}a\psi(T))$$

with some constant $\bar{c}$ (see Fernique's estimate in [2]). Therefore,

$$P(\mathcal{A}_T(G)) \leq P(M_{T'} < 1) + e^{-ca\psi(T)}, \quad T' = T(a\psi(T)\sigma_T^2)^{-1/2H}. \quad (10)$$

We introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}_\xi &= \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\log P(\mathcal{A}_T(\xi))/\psi(T) \\ \underline{\theta}_\xi &= \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\log P(\mathcal{A}_T(\xi))/\psi(T) \end{aligned}$$

for $\xi = M, Z, G$.

Taking into account (8) and (9), we obtain

$$\bar{\theta}_M \geq \bar{\theta}_Z \geq \bar{\theta}_G \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\theta}_M \geq \underline{\theta}_Z \geq \underline{\theta}_G. \quad (11)$$

Suppose that $\bar{\theta}_M < \infty$. Using (10), we get

$$P(A_T(G)) \leq P(M_{T'} < 1)(1 + \exp(-\bar{c}a\psi(T) + \theta\psi(T')))$$

for $T > T_0$ and $\theta > \bar{\theta}_M$. By the assumption (5b), $\psi(T') = \psi(T)(1 + o(1))$. Hence,

$$\bar{\theta}_G > \bar{\theta}_M \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\theta}_G \geq \underline{\theta}_M \quad (12)$$

because 'a' is arbitrary.

In the opposite case, $\bar{\theta}_M = \infty$, ($\underline{\theta}_M = \infty$) instead of (12) one has $\bar{\theta}_G \geq ac$ ($\underline{\theta}_G \geq ac$) for any a . Therefore, $\theta_\xi = \infty$ for $\xi = M, Z$ and G . By (11), (12), it is clear that the decay exponents for $\mathcal{A}_T(\xi)$, $\xi = M, G, Z$ can exist only simultaneously and these exponents are equal. $\diamond$

Let $\Gamma = \{g\}$ be a group of continuous 1 : 1 transformations of R^d . A random process $x(s)$ is homogeneous in Γ if $\{x(gs)\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{x(s)\}$ for any $g \in \Gamma$. Two domains Δ_1 and Δ_2 are equivalent if $\Delta_2 = g\Delta_1$ for some $g \in \Gamma$. By definition, a set of equivalent domains $\{\Delta_i\}$ form Δ_0 -parquet of G if $\Delta_i \cap \Delta_j = \emptyset$, $i \neq j$; $\Delta_i = g_i\Delta_0$, $g_i \in \Gamma$; and $[G] = [\cup \Delta_i]$, where $[\Delta]$ is the closure of Δ .

Proposition 1. Let $x(s)$, $s \in R^d$ be a centered continuous homogeneous in the group Γ Gaussian process. Suppose that $Ex(t)x(s) > 0$ on domains $\Delta_T \subset R^d$. If there exist integers $r_1 > r_2 > 1$ and D such that $\log r_1 / \log r_2$ is irrational, for any $T > 0$ and $r = r_1, r_2$ the domain Δ_T has $\Delta_{T/r}$ -parquet of r^D elements, then the limit

$$\theta := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (-\log P(\Delta_T))T^{-D} < \infty$$

exists. Here $P(\Delta_T) = P\{x(s) < u, s \in \Delta_T\}$ and $\Delta_T \subset \Delta_{T'}$ for $T < T'$.

PROOF. If $\{\Delta_i, i = 1, \dots, r^D\}$ form the $\Delta_{T/r}$ -parquet of Δ_T , then Slepian's lemma and the homogeneity of x in Γ imply

$$P(\Delta_T) \geq \prod_i P(\Delta_i) = [P(\Delta_{T/r})]^q, \quad q = r^D$$

or

$$\rho(T) := -\frac{\log P(\Delta_T)}{T^D} \leq -\frac{\log P(\Delta_{T/r})}{(T/r)^D}.$$

Therefore, for any $0 < a \leq r$, $r = r_1, r_2$ the sequence $\rho(ar^n)$ tends from above to a limit $\theta_a(r)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We claim that $\theta_a(r_1) = \theta_1(r_2)$, $0 < a < r_1$. Indeed, the fractional parts of the numbers

$$\log_{r_2} a + n\rho, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots; \quad \rho = \log_{r_2} r_1$$

are dense on $[0, 1]$ because ρ is irrational. Hence, there exist $n_i^\pm$ and $m_i^\pm$ such that

$$T_i^+ := ar_1^{n_i^+} = r_2^{m_i^+ + \delta_i^+}, \quad T_i^- := ar_1^{n_i^-} = r_2^{m_i^- - \delta_i^-},$$

where $\delta_i^\pm \geq 0$ and $\delta_i^\pm \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. But for $\tilde{T}_i^\pm = r_2^{m_i^\pm}$

$$P(\Delta_{T_i^+}) \leq P(\Delta_{\tilde{T}_i^+}) \quad \text{and} \quad P(\Delta_{T_i^-}) \geq P(\Delta_{\tilde{T}_i^-})$$

i.e.,

$$\rho(T_i^+) \geq \rho(\tilde{T}_i^+) (\tilde{T}_i^+ / T_i^+)^D = \rho(\tilde{T}_i^+) r_2^{-\delta_i^+ D}.$$

Therefore,

$$\theta_a(r_1) \geq \theta_1(r_2).$$

Similarly, using T_i^- and $\tilde{T}_i^-$ we get

$$\theta_a(r_1) \leq \theta_1(r_2).$$

This concludes the proof.

3 Fractional Brownian sheet

Theorem 2. 1. Let $x(s) = x(s_1, s_2)$, $s_i > 0$ be the fractional Brownian sheet of index $0 \leq H < 1$.

Consider $T \cdot \Delta_a = K_a \cap [0, T]^2$, where K_a is the cone $\{s : 0 < a < s_1/s_2 < a^{-1}\}$, $0 \leq a \leq 1$. Then the limit

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\log P(x(s) < 1, s \in T \cdot \Delta_a) / (\log T)^q = \theta_a(H) \quad (13)$$

exists and is nontrivial ($0 < \theta_a < \infty$) for $q = 1 + \mathbf{1}_{a=0}$.

2. Consider the dual stationary sheet $\xi(t) = \exp(-H(t_1 + t_2)) x(e^{t_1}, e^{t_2})$. Then

$$-\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-2} \log P\{\xi(t) < 0, t \in T \cdot \tilde{\Delta}\} = \theta_0(H), \quad (14)$$

where $\tilde{\Delta} = \{t : t_1 + t_2 < 2\} \cap [0, 1]^2$.

Remark. The relations (13) and (14) solve Problem 4 in ([4], p.227).

PROOF. By Li and Shao [4],

$$c_1(\log T)^2 < -\log P(x(s) < 1, s \in [0, T]^2) < c_2(\log T)^2,$$

where $c_i > 0$. In fact, the proof of this relation leads to a more general conclusion. Specifically, for the domain $V_T = T \cdot \Delta_a \cap [1, T]^2$ we have

$$c_1 n(T) < -\log P\{x(s) < 1, s \in V_T\} < c_2 n(T),$$

where $n(T)$ is the number of integer points in the domain $\tilde{V}_T = \{(\log s_1, \log s_2) : (s_1, s_2) \in V_T\}$. Obviously, $n(T) = \log T$ for the case $a > 0$. Hence we can expect nontrivial exponents with $\psi(t) = \log T$ for $a > 0$ and $\log^2 T$ for $a = 0$.

Consider $0 < a \leq 1$. To apply Theorem 1, we may use $U_0 = [0, 1]^2 \cap K_a$, $\psi(t) = \log T$ and

$$\varphi_T(s) = Ex(s_1, s_2)x(a, a) \cdot 4a^{-4H} = \prod_{i=1}^2 (1 + (s_i/a)^{2H} - |s_i/a - 1|^{2H}).$$

One has $\varphi_T(s) \geq 1$ on $K_a \setminus U_0$ because $\varphi_T(s) \geq 1$ on $[a, \infty)^2 \supset K_a \setminus U_0$. By the definition of φ_T ,

$$\|\varphi_T\|^2 = E|x(a, a) \cdot 4a^{-4H}|^2 = 16a^{-4H} < \infty.$$

It is clear that $E(x(s))^2 < 1$ on U_0 . Now $\delta_T^2(h) < ch^{2H}$, because

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2(h) &= E|x(s) - x(\tilde{s})|^2 \leq 2E|x(s) - x(\hat{s})|^2 + 2E|x(\hat{s}) - x(\tilde{s})|^2 = \\ &= 2|s_1|^{2H}|s_2 - \tilde{s}_2|^{2H} + 2|\tilde{s}_2|^{2H}|s_1 - \tilde{s}_1|^{2H} \leq \\ &\leq 2(|s_1|^{2H} + |\tilde{s}_2|^{2H}) \cdot |s_2 - \tilde{s}_2|^{2H}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{s} = (s_1, \tilde{s}_2)$. Thus, all conditions in (5) are satisfied.

It remains to prove that the limit (6) exists for

$$\mathcal{A}_T = \{x(s) < 0, s \in T \cdot \Delta_a \setminus [0, 1]^2\}$$

with $\psi(T) = \log T$. In terms of the dual stationary process

$$\xi(t) = e^{-H(t_1+t_2)}x(e^{t_1}, e^{t_2})$$

we have $\mathcal{A}_T = \{\xi(t) < 0, t \in \Delta_{\tilde{T}_0, \tilde{T}}\}$, where $\tilde{T}_0 = 0$, $\tilde{T} = \ln T$ and

$$\Delta_{c,d} = \{(t_1, t_2) : |t_1 - t_2| < |\ln a|, \quad t_1 < d, \quad t_2 < d, \quad (t_1 \geq c \text{ or } t_2 \geq c)\}.$$

We can apply Proposition 1 to the stationary process $\xi(t)$, $t \in \Delta_{\tilde{T}_0, \tilde{T}}$ because for any integer n $\Delta_{\tilde{T}_0, \tilde{T}} = \cup \Delta_{c_i, c_{i+1}}$, $c_i = (\tilde{T}/n)i$, $i = 0, 1, \dots$, and $\Delta_{c_i, c_{i+1}} = g(c_i)\Delta_{0, T/n}$, where $g(a)(t_1, t_2) = (t_1 + a, t_2 + a)$. As a result, we get the existence of the limit

$$\theta_a = -\lim(\log P(\mathcal{A}_T))/\log T, \quad T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Consider the case $a = 0$. Here $T \cdot \Delta_0 = [0, T]^2$ and $S_0 = \{s : s_1 s_2 = 0\}$. We will use $U_0 = \{s : s_1 s_2 < 1\}$ as a vicinity of S_0 and define the coordinates on $U_0 \cap [0, T]^2$ as follows:

$$a_1 = s_1/T, \quad a_2 = s_1 s_2, \quad a = (a_1, a_2) \in [0, 1]^2.$$

One has $E|x(s)|^2 \leq 1$ on U_0 . The next lemma shows that $\sigma_0^2(T)$ in (5c) is $O(\log T)$ and therefore (5b) holds.

Lemma 1. For the fractional Brownian sheet

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\{E|x(s) - x(\tilde{s})|^2, s, \tilde{s} \subset U_0 \cap [0, T]^2, |s_1 - \tilde{s}_1| < hT, |s_1 s_2 - \tilde{s}_1 \tilde{s}_2| < h\} \\ = \delta_T^2(h) < c_H(1 + 2T^{-2}h^{-1})^{-2H} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$-\int_0^1 \delta_T(h) d\sqrt{\ln h} \leq c\sqrt{\ln T}, \quad T > T_0.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. In the above estimate of $\delta^2(h)$ we may use both $\hat{s} = (s_1, \tilde{s}_2)$ and $\hat{s} = (\tilde{s}_1, s_2)$. Therefore, taking into account the inequality

$$a^h + b^h \leq c_h(a + b)^h, \quad c_h = 2^{(1-h)_+}, \quad a > 0, b > 0, h > 0,$$

one has

$$E|x(s) - x(\tilde{s})|^2 \leq 2c_{2H}(E|w(s) - w(\tilde{s})|^2)^{2H},$$

where $w(s)$ is the Brownian sheet corresponding to the index $H = 1/2$. Consequently, it is sufficient to estimate $\delta_T^2(h)$ for $w(s)$ only. One has

$$\delta^2 = E|w(s) - w(\tilde{s})|^2 = |(o\tilde{s}) \setminus (os)| + |(os) \setminus (o\tilde{s})| = R_1 + R_2,$$

where $(os) = [0, s_1] \times [0, s_2]$ and $|G|$ is the area of G .

Consider $R_1 = |o\tilde{s} \setminus (os)|$ and suppose that $s_1 s_2 = a_2 > \tilde{s}_1 \tilde{s}_2 = \tilde{a}_2$, $a_2 - \tilde{a}_2 = \delta a_2 \leq h$. There are three possibilities.

First, $(o\tilde{s}) \subset (os)$. Then $\delta^2 = a_2 - \tilde{a}_2 < h$.

Second, $\tilde{s}_1 > s_1$. In the notation $s_1 = Ta_1$, $\tilde{s}_1 = T\tilde{a}_1$ one has

$$R_1 = (\tilde{s}_1 - s_1)\tilde{s}_2 = \frac{\tilde{a}_2}{\tilde{s}_1}\delta s_1 = \frac{a_2 - \delta a_2}{s_1 + \delta s_1}\delta s_1 < \frac{a_2 \cdot hT}{s_1 + Th}$$

because $\delta s_1 = T\delta a_1 < Th$. Since $s_1 s_2 = a_2$ and $s_2 < T$, we obtain $s_1 > a_2/T$.

Hence $R_1 < h/(h + T^{-2})$ because $a_2 < 1$.

Third, $\tilde{s}_2 > s_2$, $\tilde{s}_1 < s_1$. Here $R_1 = s_2(s_1 - \tilde{s}_1) = \delta s_1 a_1/s_1$.

If $a_1/\tilde{s}_1 < T$, then $a_1/(s_1 - \delta s_1) < T$ or $s_1 > a_1/T + \delta s_1$, so that

$$R_1 < \frac{a_1 \delta s_1}{\delta s_1 + a_1/T} < h/(h + T^{-2}).$$

If $a_1/\tilde{s}_1 > T$, then $\tilde{a}_2/\tilde{s}_1 < 1$, i.e., $s_1 > \delta s_1 + \tilde{a}_2/T$, and so

$$R_1 = \delta s_1 \cdot a_1/s_1 < \frac{\tilde{a}_2 + \delta a_2}{\delta s_1 + \tilde{a}_2/T}\delta s_1 < \frac{h}{h + T^{-2}(1 - h)} = \frac{hk}{h + T^{-2}k},$$

where $k = (1 - T^{-2})^{-1} < 2$, $T > T_0$. As a result, $R_1 < 2h(h + 2T^{-2})^{-1}$.

Similarly, we get the same estimate for R_2 . This completes the proof of the first part of Lemma 1. Using for $x(\cdot)$ the estimate

$$\delta_T^2(h) \leq c(1 + 2T^{-2}h^{-1})^{-2H},$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^1 \delta_T(h) d\sqrt{\ln 1/h} &\leq c_1 \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \sqrt{\ln u/\varepsilon} (1 + u)^{-H-1} du \\ &< c_1 \int_0^{\infty} (\sqrt{|\ln u|} + \sqrt{\ln 1/\varepsilon}) (1 + u)^{-H-1} du = O(\ln 1/\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

We have integrated by parts and replaced h by $u = \varepsilon/h$ with $\varepsilon = 2T^{-2}$. $\diamond$

Let us continue the proof of Theorem 2. Consider the random variable

$$\eta_T = 4 \sum_{|n| \leq N} x(2^n, 2^{-n}), \quad N = [\log_2 T] + 1$$

and the function $\varphi_T(s) = Ex(s)\eta_T$.

By definition, $\varphi_T(s) \in \mathcal{H}_x$ and $\|\varphi_T\|_x^2 = E\eta_T^2$. The sequence $\xi_n = 4x(2^n, 2^{-n})$, $n = 0, \pm 1, \dots$, is stationary with the correlation function

$$B(n) = (2^{-2Hn} + 1 - |2^{-n} - 1|^{2H})^2 \cdot 2^{2Hn} > 0.$$

Since $B(n) = O(2^{-n\gamma})$, $\gamma = 2 \cdot \min(H, 1 - H)$, it follows that

$$\|\varphi_T\|_x^2 = \sum_{(n,m) \leq N} B(n-m) \leq c \cdot N,$$

where $c = \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} B(n) < \infty$. Hence, $\|\varphi_T\|_x^2 = O(\ln T)$.

To show that $\varphi_T(s) > 1$ on $[0, T]^2 \setminus U_0$, note that

$$f(x) = |x|^{2H} + 1 - |x - 1|^{2H} > 1, \quad x > 1/2, \quad H > 0.$$

But $\psi_a(s) = Ex(s) \cdot 4x(a, a^{-1}) = f(s_1/a)f(s_2a)$. Hence, $\psi_a(s) > 1$ for $s \in [a/2, \infty) \times [a^{-1}/2, \infty)$ and

$$\varphi_T(s) = \sum_{|n| < N} \psi_{2^n}(s) > 1$$

for $s \in \bigcup_{|n| \leq N} [2^{n-1}, \infty) \times [2^{-n-1}, \infty) \supset [0, T]^2 \setminus U_0$ because $\psi_a(s) \geq 0$.

To prove (6), we consider

$$A_T(Z) = \{x(s) < 0, s \in [0, T]^2 \setminus U_0\}$$

and the dual stationary process $\xi(t)$ again. In terms of ξ

$$A_T(Z) = \{\xi(t) < 0, t_1 < \tilde{T}, t_2 < \tilde{T}, t_1 + t_2 > 0\}, \quad \tilde{T} = \ln T.$$

Since

$$\{\xi(e_1 t_1 + a_1, e_2 t_2 + a_2)\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{\xi(t_1, t_2)\} \quad (15)$$

for any fixed (a_1, a_2) and $e_i = \pm 1$, the event

$$A_{\tilde{T}}(Z) = \{\xi(t) < 0, t_i \geq 0, t_1 + t_2 < 2\tilde{T}\}$$

has the same probability as $A_T(Z)$. To apply Proposition 1, we divide

$$\Delta_{\tilde{T}} = \{(t_1, t_2) : t_1 > 0, t_2 > 0, t_1 + t_2 < 2\tilde{T}\}$$

into n^2 equal triangles Δ_i using lines $t_1 = a_n i$, $t_2 = a_n i$ and $t_1 + t_2 = a_n i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$ with $a_n = (2\tilde{T})/n$. By (15), all Δ_i are equivalent. Hence, we can apply Proposition 1 to $\{\xi(t), t \in \Delta_{\tilde{T}}\}$ with the parameter $D = 2$.

4 Integrated fractional Brownian motion

Let $x_H(s) = \int_0^s b_H(t) dt$, $s \in \mathbb{R}^1$ be the integrated fractional Brownian motion and $\Delta_i = (i, 1)$, $i = 0, -1$. Sinai [12] showed that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\log P\{x_H(s) < 1, s \in T \cdot \Delta_i\} / \log T = \theta_H(\Delta_i),$$

exists for $H = 1/2$ and $\theta_{1/2}(\Delta_0) = 1/4$. The existence of both $\theta_H(\Delta_0)$ for $0 < H < 1$ and $\theta_H(\Delta_{-1})$ for $1/2 \leq H < 1$ can be deduced from the relation $Ex_H(s)x_H(t) \geq 0$ for $s, t \in \Delta_i$ (see [4] or Proposition 1).

The numerical simulation [9, 11] suggests that $\theta_0 = H(1 - H)$ and $\theta_{-1} = 1 - H$. The symmetry of the hypothetical quantity θ_0 , i.e., $\theta_0(H) = \theta_0(1 - H)$, is quite unexpected. For this reason the lower bound for θ_0 given below is important. As the numerical analysis shows, differences in the behavior of $b_H(t)$ for $H < 1/2$ and $H > 1/2$ are seen in the antisymmetry of the logarithmic correction exponent, that is

$$P(x_H(t) < 0, t \in [1, T]) \sim cT^{\theta_0}(\ln T)^{\alpha(H)},$$

where $\alpha(H) = -\alpha(1 - H)$ (for more detail see [11]).

Proposition 2. For $x_H(s)$ there exists $0 < \rho < 1$ such that

$$\rho H(1 - H) \leq \theta_H(\Delta_0) \leq \theta_H(\Delta_{-1}) \leq 1 - H \quad (16)$$

if $\theta_H(\Delta_{-1})$ exists.

PROOF. We begin by evaluating $\theta_{-1} := \theta_H(\Delta_{-1})$ for the case $\Delta_{-1} = (-1, 1)$. Let $c(t)$ be the convex minorant of $x(t) + t^2/2$. Then $\dot{c}(t)$ is a continuous increasing function and $d\dot{c}(t)$ is a measure with support S . If $t \in S$, then $\dot{c}(t) = \dot{x}(t)$, where $\dot{x} = \text{FBM}$; t cannot be an isolated point because of the continuity of $\dot{c}(t)$. If $\Delta \cap S \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\int_{\Delta} d\dot{c} = |\dot{c}(s_1) - \dot{c}(s_2)| = |\dot{x}(s_1) - \dot{x}(s_2) + s_1 - s_2|$$

for some points $s_1, s_2 \in \Delta \cap S$. As is well known, FBM belongs to the Hölder class of index $\alpha < H$, [3]. More exactly, for any finite interval $[a, b]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $\delta_0 > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that $|\dot{x}(t) - \dot{x}(s)| < c|t - s|^{H-\varepsilon}$ a.s. as soon as $|t - s| < \delta_0$. Hence,

$$\int_{\Delta} d\dot{c} < b|\Delta|^{H-\varepsilon}$$

for small enough $\Delta \subset [a, b]$ such that $\Delta \cap S \neq \emptyset$. By Frostman's Lemma [3], $\dim S \geq H - \varepsilon$ a.s. Thus, $\dim S \geq H$ because ε is arbitrary.

On the other hand, if θ_{-1} is the decay exponent for the event $\mathcal{A}_T(M, \Delta)$, $\Delta = (-1, 1)$, then $\dim S \leq 1 - \theta_{-1}$ (see [9]). Hence, $H \leq \dim S \leq 1 - \theta_{-1}$. From the relation $\mathcal{A}_T(M, (0, 1)) \supset \mathcal{A}_T(M, (-1, 1))$ one has $\theta_0 \leq \theta_{-1}$, where θ_0 is related to $\Delta = (0, 1)$.

To evaluate θ_0 , note that

$$\theta_0 = \theta_{\xi} = - \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \ln P(\xi(t) < 0, t \in (0, T))/T, \quad (17)$$

where $\xi(t) = x(e^t) \cdot e^{-(1+H)t}$ is the dual stationary process. By Lemma 2 (see below),

$$B_\xi(t) = E\xi(0)\xi(t) \leq [\cosh(a(H)t)]^{-1}, \quad a(H) = \rho H(1-H)$$

for some fixed $0 < \rho < 1$.

Applying Slepian's lemma [5], one has

$$P(\xi(t) < 0, t \in (0, T)) \leq P(\eta(t) < 0, t \in (0, 2a(H)T)),$$

where $\eta(t)$ is the stationary process with correlation function $[\cosh(t/2)]^{-1}$. Hence $\theta_0 = \theta_\xi \geq 2a(H)\theta_\eta$, where θ_η is the decay exponent of type (17) for the process $\eta(t)$. By [4], $2\theta_\eta \geq 0.2$. Thus, $\theta_0 \geq 0.2\rho H(1-H)$. $\diamond$

Lemma 2. Let $\xi(t)$ be the dual stationary process of the integrated fractional Brownian motion of index H . Then the correlation function of $\xi(t)$

$$B_H(t) = [2(1+H)(e^{Ht} + e^{-Ht}) - (e^{(1+H)t} + e^{-(1+H)t}) + (e^{t/2} - e^{-t/2})^{2H+2}]/(2+4H) \quad (18)$$

is nondecreasing and there exists $0 < \rho < 1$ such that

$$B_H(t) \leq 1/\cosh(\rho H \bar{H} t), \quad \bar{H} = 1-H \quad (19)$$

for any $0 < H < 1$.

PROOF. Suppose that $B_H(t)$ is nondecreasing and (19) holds for $t \in [0, t_0] \cup [t_1, \infty)$ with a fixed $\rho = \rho_0$. Then (19) holds for any t with $\rho = \rho' = \rho_0 t_0/t_1$. Actually, for $t < t_1$

$$B_H(t) \leq B_H(t \cdot t_0/t_1) \leq 1/\cosh(\rho' H \bar{H} t)$$

and for $t > t_1$

$$B_H(t) \leq 1/\cosh(\rho_0 H \bar{H} t) \leq 1/\cosh(\rho' H \bar{H} t).$$

Now we prove our admissions.

Admission 1: $B'_H(t) \leq 0$. One has

$$B'_H(t) = -(1+H)(2+4H)^{-1}e^{(1+H)t}R(e^{-t}), \quad (20)$$

where

$$R(x) = 1 - 2Hx - (1-x)^{2H}(1-x^2) + 2Hx^{2H+1} - x^{2+2H}. \quad (21)$$

Below we use the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} (1-x)^q &= 1 + \sum_1^N q(q-1)\dots(q-k+1)(-x)^k/k! + \\ &+ q(q-1)\dots(q-N)(-x)^{N+1}r_{N+1}(q)/N!, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $(q \vee N)^{-1} \leq r_N(q) \leq (q \wedge N)^{-1}$.

Using (21) and (22), we get

$$\begin{aligned} R(x) &= (1-2Hx)x^2 - (2H-1)x^2(H+\bar{H} \cdot 2Hr_3(2H)x)(1-x^2) + \\ &+ x^{2H-1}(2H-x)x^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the case $2H > 1$ one has $2Hr_3(2H) < 1$ and $x^{2H-1} > x$. Hence,

$$R(x) \geq x^2(1-x^2)\bar{H}((2H-1)(1-x)+2) \geq 0. \quad (23)$$

In the opposite case, $2H < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(x) &= (1-x^{2H})x^2 + 2Hx^{2H+1}(1-x^{2\bar{H}}) + \\ &+ H(1-2H)x^2(1+2\bar{H}r_3(2H)x)(1-x^2) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Thus, $R(x) \geq 0$ and $B_H(t)$ is nondecreasing.

Admission 2: relation (19) for small t .

By (20),

$$1 - B_H(t) \geq b(H) \int_x^1 R(u) du, \quad x = e^{-t}, \quad (25)$$

where $b(H) = (1 + H)/(2 + 4H)$. Using (23) and (24), one has

$$R(u) \geq \begin{cases} 2\bar{H}u^2(1 - u^2), & 2H > 1 \\ (1 - u^{2H})u^2 \geq 2Hu^2(1 - u), & 2H < 1. \end{cases}$$

Substituting these inequalities in (25), we get on integration

$$1 - B_H(t) \geq b(1) \cdot 2\bar{H}(1 - x)^2 \varphi_1(x_0), \quad 2H > 1, \quad t < -\ln x_0 = t_0,$$

where $\varphi_1(x) = (2 + 4x + 6x^2 + 3x^3)/15$, and

$$1 - B_H(t) \geq b(1/2) \cdot 2H(1 - x)^2 \varphi_2(x_0), \quad 2H < 1, \quad t < t_0,$$

where $\varphi_2(x) = (1 + 2x + 3x^2)/12$.

As a result, $1 - B_H(t) \geq 2AH\bar{H}(1 - x)^2$, $t < t_0$, where

$$A = \min(\varphi_1(x_0) \cdot b(1), \varphi_2(x_0) \cdot b(1/2)) = \varphi_1(x_0)/3.$$

Since

$$1 - x = 1 - e^{-t} > t \cdot e^{-t} > x_0 t,$$

$1 - u^2 < 1/\cosh(\sqrt{2}u)$, and $1 > 2(H\bar{H})^{1/2}$, one has

$$B_H(t) \leq 1/\cosh(2x_0(AH\bar{H})^{1/2}) < 1/\cosh(\rho H\bar{H}t), \quad t < \ln 1/x_0 = t_0,$$

where $\rho = 4x_0 A^{1/2}$.

Admission 3: relation (19) for large t .

Using (18) and (22), we get

$$B_H(t) \leq (1+H)(1+2H)^{-1}e^{-Ht} - 2^{-1}(1+2H)^{-1}e^{-(1+H)t} + (1+H)e^{-\bar{H}t}/2 - H(1+H)e^{-(1+\bar{H})t}/3 + H(2H-1)e^{-t(2+\bar{H})}\mathbf{1}_{2H>1}/6. \quad (26)$$

Here we use (22) with $q = 2H + 2$, $N = 1$ for the case $2H < 1$ and with $q = 2H + 2$, $N = 2$ for the case $2H > 1$.

The case $2H < 1$. By (26),

$$B_H(t) \leq (1+H)(1+2H)^{-1}e^{-Ht} \times [1 + 0.5e^{-(1-2H)t}\{1 + 2H - (1+H)^{-1}e^{-2Ht}\}]. \quad (27)$$

Using $1 - e^x \leq x$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0.5\{\cdot\} &= 0.5\{2H + H(1+H)^{-1} + (1+H)^{-1}(1 - e^{-2Ht})\} \\ &\leq H(1 + 2^{-1}(1+H)^{-1} + t(1+H)^{-1}) \leq H(1.5 + t). \end{aligned}$$

If $2H < 1 - \varepsilon$, then

$$e^{-(1-2H)t}(1.5 + t) \leq \max_t(e^{-\varepsilon t}(1.5 + t)) = e^{1.5\varepsilon}/(e\varepsilon) = a_\varepsilon.$$

Hence, for $2H < 1 - \varepsilon$

$$B_H(t) \leq e^{-Ht}(1 + Ha_\varepsilon) < e^{-H(t-a_\varepsilon)}. \quad (28)$$

By (27), for $1 - \varepsilon < 2H < 1$

$$B_H(t) \leq 2e^{-Ht} \leq e^{-H(t-b_\varepsilon)}, \quad (29)$$

where $b_\varepsilon = \ln 4/(1 - \varepsilon)$.

The case $2H > 1$. By (26),

$$\begin{aligned} B_H(t) &\leq 2^{-1}(1+H)e^{-\bar{H}t} + \\ &+ (1+H)(1+2H)^{-1}e^{-Ht}(1 - H(1+2H)e^{-2\bar{H}t}/3) - \\ &- 2^{-1}(1+2H)^{-1}e^{-(1+H)t}(1 - H(4H^2 - 1)e^{-2\bar{H}t}/3) \\ &\leq 0.5(1+H)e^{-\bar{H}t}[1 + 2(1+2H)^{-1}e^{-(2H-1)t} \times \\ &\times \{1 - H(1+2H)/3 + H(1+2H)(1 - e^{-2\bar{H}t})/3\}]. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as above, we find that $\{\cdot\} < \bar{H}(1 + 2t)$ and $[\cdot] < 1 + \bar{H}d_\varepsilon$ at last arriving at a bound like (28) if $0 < 2\bar{H} < 1 - \varepsilon$. In the case $1 - \varepsilon < 2\bar{H} < 1$, we get (29) again. Thus,

$$B_H(t) \leq e^{-\bar{H} \wedge H(t-t_0)}.$$

But $(\bar{H} \wedge H) \cdot (t - t_0) > H\bar{H}t$ for $t > t_0(1 - H \vee \bar{H})^{-1} > 2t_0$. Hence, $B_H(t) \leq 1/\cosh(H\bar{H}t)$ for $t > 2t_0$.

References

- [1] Csáki, E., Khoshnevisan, D. and Shi, Z. (2000). Boundary crossings and the distribution function of the maximum of Brownian sheet. *Stochastic Process, Appl.* **90**, 1-18.
- [2] Fernique, X. (1975). Regularite des trajectoires des fonctions aleatoires gaussiennes, *Lectures Notes in Mathematics*, **480**, 2-187.
- [3] Falconer, K. (1995). *Fractal Geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [4] Li, W.V. and Shao, Q.-M. (2004). Lower tail probabilities for Gaussian processes. *The Annals of Probability* **32**, N 1A, 216-242.
- [5] Lifshits, M.A. (1995). *Gaussian Random Functions*, PF&MS, Kiev, (in Russian).
- [6] Majumdar, S.N. (1999). Persistence in nonequilibrium systems. *Current Science* **77**:3, 370-375.
- [7] Molchan, G. (1999). Maximum of a fractional Brownian motion: probabilities of small values, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **205**, 97-111.
- [8] Molchan, G. (2001). On a maximum of stable Levy processes, *Theory of Prob. and its Applications*, **45**, 343-349.
- [9] Molchan, G. and Khokhlov, A. (2004). Small values of the maximum for the integral of fractional Brownian motion, *J. Stat. Phys.*, **114**, No 3/4, 923-946.
- [10] Molchan, G. and Turcotte, D. (2002). A stochastic model of sedimentation: probabilities and multifractality, *Euro. J. Appl. Math.* **13**, 371-383.
- [11] Molchan, G. and Khokhlov, A. (2003). Unilateral small deviations for the integral of fractional Brownian motion. *Arxiv: math. PR/0310413*, 26 Oct. (2003).
- [12] Sinai, Ya.G. (1992). Distribution of some functionals of the integral of a random walk, *Theor. Math. Phys.*, **90**, 219-241.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EARTHQUAKE PREDICTION THEORY AND
MATHEMATICAL GEOPHYSICS,
79, k2, Varshavskoe sh., 117556, Moscow,
RUSSIA
E-mail: molchan@mitp.ru